DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 293 UD 023 776

AUTHOR Alkin, Marvin; And Others
TITLE Evaluation of the Magnet School Programs.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Unified School District, Calif. Research and Evaluation Branch.
PUB DATE 1 Jul 83
NOTE 84p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Desegregation Effects; Elementary Secondary Education; *Magnet Schools; Parent Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Racial Relations; School Demography; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Urban Schools; *Voluntary Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS *Los Angeles Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

This report details the technical aspects of an evaluation of Magnet School programs in the Los Angeles Unified School District in 1982-83. It focuses on implementation during that year and on progress made toward reducing harms of racial isolation. A prologue considers the social, economic, and governmental context affecting the analysis and interpretation of findings. Chapter I briefly describes the Magnet programs and focuses on their educational offerings as well as the students who choose to enroll in them. Chapter II presents study methodology; evaluation questions, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis are discussed. Chapter III provides the results of the study, organized around these major evaluation questions: (1) What changes have been made in mechanisms for explaining program options to parents and students during 1982-83? (2) What are the characteristics of students chosen to participate? (3) Do program mechanisms result in students being enrolled in desegregated schools? (4) How do policies and procedures inhibit or contribute to integration? (5) What types of services are delivered as part of the program? (6) What are the perceptions and attitudes of school personnel toward the program? (7) What arrangements have been undertaken to address particular areas of concern? and (8) What progress appears to have been made in reducing the harms set forth in the Crawford decision? Other findings presented concern the attitudes of student participants, the post-secondary opportunities available to them, and their social behavior toward other ethnic groups. Finally, major findings are summarized and recommendations are made. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248293

Evaluation of the

Magnet School Programs

by

Evaluation Planning Team

Marvin Alkin, Ed.D.
Nancy Atwood, Ph.D.
Eva Baker, Ed.D.
Winston Doby, Ed.D.
William Doherty, Ph.D.

with

Los Angeles Unified School District
Research and Evaluation Branch

July 1, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Stevens

LAUSD

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UD023776

Approved:
Floraline I. Stevens
Director
Research and Evalution Branch
Joseph P. Linscomb
Associate Superintendent, Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Prologue	1
Chapter I Introduction	5
Chapter II Methodology	12
Chapter III Findings and Recommendations	25

PROLOGUE

This report has been prepared as part of a two-year effort to evaluate the Voluntary Integration and Year-Round Schools (YRS) programs for the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The report is intended to meet the requirement imposed by the Court Order of September, 1981. Specifically, the Superior Court ordered the Los Angeles Unified School District to provide by July 15, 1983 "...a full report of the measures taken and achieved under its voluntary integration plan." In response to this mandate, our studies have focused on both elements. With respect to "measures taken" we have considered the implementation of programs as well as the actions taken by the LAUSD in response to earlier findings of the Evaluation Planning Team (EPT). We base our judgments on the "results achieved" on the District's progress in ameliorating the harms of racial isolation as referenced in the original Crawford report. Our judgments of the District's efforts on both implementing measures and achieving results are based on multiple data sources. Quantitative and interpretive data from earlier reports and from the current year's studies are of course, important inputs. In addition, these data are complemented by our own interviews, discussions, and professional judgments based on three years of examining the Voluntary Integration and Year-Round Schools programs.

The Evaluation Planning Team members were originally invited to participate in the LAUSD evaluation efforts under the mandatory desegregation plan. The relationship of the Team to the District has been complex. The identification of issues has been shared by the Team and LAUSD. The development and design of specific evaluation questions, methodology, and instruments have been prerogatives of the Evaluation Planning Team, in consultation with District personnel. Data collection has been conducted using LAUSD personnel and personnel of neighboring universities, as well as the Team members. The analyses, interpretations, and recommendations for this report, as our earlier reports, represent the work of the Team members. Throughout, we have worked within the constraints of resources, time, personnel, and information bases.

Context

In our work, we have become especially aware of the importance of context in the analysis and interpretation of findings, particularly so because our process has extended over a number of years, and we have found that assumptions, points-of-view, and facts change over time.

Let us consider the context in three parts: 1) the nature of the greater Los Angeles Area served by the LAUSD, 2) the changes in LAUSD, and 3) the effect of State and Federal policy changes on the operations of LAUSD.

The Greater Los Angeles Area. The area serviced by LAUSD is a clear factor in any District study. Its boundaries include 464 square miles, within which could be placed the combined areas of all of Boston, Cleveland, Denver, Manhattan, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, Providence, and Washington, D.C. The District serves all of the city of Los Angeles, seven other incorporated cities, and portions of 18 other municipalities. The city of Los Angeles is more than 50 miles across at its widest point, split by the Santa Monica Mountains. The San Fernando Valley alone, with an area of 235 square miles and a population of 1.5 million, is second only in size to Los Angeles in California and seventh in population in the country.

Demographically, the Los Angeles area is enormously diverse. Seventy language groups (requiring bilingual attention) are represented in the District. The majority of students in the District come from Spanish speaking environments, many from families of Mexican descent. There are, as well, substantial numbers from other Latin American countries and a small but growing population from Asia. The demographic changes in the area have been dramatic in the last decade and have strongly influenced the District's educational efforts.

The size of the Los Angeles region, in part, has created sets of intact communities, many with the appearance of insularity. Rather than a single city with a ring of suburban areas, Los Angeles is more like a confederation of communities. Newer immigrants tend to settle in older parts of the city near families of similar backgrounds, although the San Fernando Valley has substantial new immigration as well. Residential housing patterns have developed based on the initial location of immigrants and on the dominance of Anglo population in the San Fernando Valley. Although one would expect residential distinctions to reduce over time, the high property values in the

area with other factors have mitigated against substantial population shifts and natural integration of racial and ethnic groups. These population patterns result in school areas in some parts of the District that are overcrowded while others are underpopulated.

Context of LAUSD. Because the scope of effort and public concern is normally broad, we will consider only a few contextual factors (listed below) which have impact on the processes of the Voluntary Integration and Year-Round Schools programs and the District.

- The leadership in LAUSD has changed during this period, permitting the new Superintendent to define his own program goals, activities, and relationships with the LAUSD Board of Education, staff, and with other constituencies.

- The schools have experienced some of the same financial constraints felt by other public sectors since the tax reform efforts, culminating with Proposition 13. Thus, the District has been required to notify substantial numbers of teachers that they might not be rehired because of fiscal limitations.

- Paradoxically, almost throughout, a teacher shortage has existed in mathematics and science.

- The racial distribution of the District in 1982-83 included about equal proportions of Black and Anglo students (22% each), about 8% Asian, and approximately 49% Hispanic students. More than 544,000 students (1982-83 figures) are taught by teachers in 826 schools.

State and Federal Context. Education has been topical throughout the last few years with attention given to funding bases, student academic performance, educational equity and educational quality as central issues. Policy changes in available funds for categorical programs reduced the amount of federal support to LAUSD in 1982-83. The Serrano suit deliberations have resulted in the use of

"per pupil costs" as a proxy measure of educational quality. The decision has also increased the State's interests in influencing local school districts. California's 1982 election sharpened the issues related to the role of State leadership in education, and focused attention on performance and academic preparation.

Nationally, the question of educational quality has also been raised by the Federal Commission on Educational Excellence and by other national reports assessing the quality of schooling. The concern for educational quality has been directed mainly at student performance shown, for instance, by tightening requirements for admission to California universities and by systems of statewide assessment and proficiency testing. In California, as in some other states, the educational quality issue has been extended to teachers through the administration of skill tests for teachers in areas termed "basic" literacy. Further reports in national media have raised questions about the quality of people entering the teaching profession. There has been less rhetoric and attention, both state-wide and nationally to the issue of educational equity or the specific concern about the education of minority students. The joint concerns of student and teacher performance have led to some positive movement in increasing: 1) the expectations for students, 2) the meaning of grades, and 3) the basic skill requirements at the local level. It is against the general context of these social facts and orientations that this report is presented.

Chapter I
Introduction

This report describes the evaluation of the Magnet School programs operating in the Los Angeles Unified School District during 1982-83. It is part of an ongoing evaluation of Magnet programs that began in 1981 and is being conducted by the Voluntary Integration Evaluation Planning Team in collaboration with the Research and Evaluation Branch of the District. The primary focus of the evaluation was on the implementation of Magnet programs during 1982-83 and also on the progress made toward the reduction of the harms of racial isolation identified in the Crawford case.

Organization of the Report

This report details the technical aspects of the evaluation effort. Chapter I presents a brief description of the history of the Magnet programs in the District and an overview of the types of educational offerings provided by magnets as well as the students who chose to enroll in them. Chapter II describes the methodology used to conduct the study. It includes a description of the issues addressed by the evaluation and the procedures used for sampling, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter III presents the results of the study organized around the major evaluation questions developed for the study. Supplemental tables, the evaluation design and data collection instruments are included in the Appendix to this report. For a more general discussion of the context in which the evaluation took place and the findings and recommendations formulated by the Team, the reader is encouraged to consult the Prologue that precedes this report and an Evaluation Summary of this report located in Research and Evaluation Publication 437, Los Angeles Unified School District.

History of the Magnet Programs

The Magnet programs were established by the District in 1977 as part of its Voluntary Integration programs. The goal of the programs was to establish and maintain programs with specialized curricular offerings that would draw students of various ethnic backgrounds thereby creating desegregated learning environments.

Magnet programs are organized as either full school magnets or as smaller magnet centers located on the campuses of regular schools. Each magnet program

is developed around either a specialized subject matter area such as math/science, performing arts, or business, or a specialized instructional approach such as fundamental or alternative schools, or students with particular needs such as the gifted or the highly gifted. In all cases, all students receive instruction in the basic subjects required for promotion or graduation.

The Magnet programs began with three programs at the elementary level in 1977-78. Since that time, the program has expanded steadily (see Table I-1). Over the past five years, the District has established a variety of programs at the elementary and junior high school level based on specialized instructional approaches (i.e., process-oriented), specialized curricular offerings (i.e., content-oriented), and students with particular needs (i.e., special population). Further, a substantial program expansion occurred in 1981 when 20 new programs were established at the senior high school level.

By 1982-83, the Magnet programs included 86 schools and centers (43 elementary and extended, 19 junior high, and 24 senior high schools). With the most recent program expansion, elementary magnets represent 9% of the total elementary school programs in the District, junior high magnets represent 24% of the total junior high school programs, and senior high magnets represent 32% of the total senior high school programs.

Magnet programs drew almost 20,000 students during 1982-83. Taken together, these students represent approximately 3.5% of the total District enrollment. Many of the magnets, particularly at the elementary level, achieved desegregated status in their enrollment. However, many of the programs located in PHBAO (predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian, and Other non-Anglo) areas, while providing specialized educational offerings, have not attracted sufficient numbers of White students to yield desegregated environments.

Types of Magnet Programs

A wide variety of educational offerings are provided under the sponsorship of the Magnet programs. Table I-2 summarizes the types of programs available during the 1982-83 year at the elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels. The table is organized around the three types of specialized offerings available: curricular specialty (content-oriented), instructional specialty (process-oriented), and student specialty (special population).

Table I-1
Expansion of the Magnet Programs
(1977 to 1983)

Level and Type of Program	77-78	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83
Elementary (and Extended)						
Process-Oriented	1	11	13	14	14	14
Content-Oriented	2	3	7	13	12	13
Special Population	0	9	11	15	16	16
Junior High						
Process-Oriented	0	4	4	4	4	3
Content-Oriented	0	4	5	5	6	6
Special Population	0	4	7	10	11	10
Senior High						
Process-Oriented (College Incentive)	0	0	0	0	7	8
Content-Oriented	0	1	2	1	14	16
Total	3	36	49	62	84	86

Table I-2
Types and Number of Magnet Programs
Operating During 1982-83

Type of Program	Number of Programs* Elementary Grades 1-6	Junior High Grades 7-9	Senior High Grades 10-12
A. Curricular Specialty (Content-Oriented)			
Arts/Math/Science	1	1	--
Business	--	--	1
Centers for Enriched Studies	3	3	2
College Incentive Program	--	--	8
Communication Arts	--	--	1
Computer Science/Math Science/Biology/Marine Science	2	2	6
Health and Medical Careers	--	1	2
Humanities Core	--	--	2
Multilingual/Multicultural	1	1	--
Performing Theatre Arts/TV-Cinema/Music	3	2	2
Technical Occupations	--	--	1
Visual Arts	--	--	1
B. Instructional Specialty (Process-Oriented)			
Alternative Schools	4	4	4
Community School	1	1	--
Fundamental Schools	10	4	--
Individually Guided Education	1	--	--
Open School	1	--	--
C. Student Specialty (Special Population)			
Gifted/Highly Achieving	12	9	--
Highly Gifted	4	2	--

*Some programs extend across traditional grade level configurations (e.g., alternative schools extend from grades 1-12). In these cases, they are counted in each grade level category served, so the total exceeds 86.

In order to provide a sense of the range of educational offerings provided by magnets, brief descriptions of selected programs are provided below. The descriptions are not comprehensive but were selected to illustrate the diversity of programmatic offerings.

Animal and Biological Sciences Center (Grades 10-12): This magnet is located at the Los Angeles Zoo in Griffith Park. Students may choose one of two study tracks: one leading to possible employment as an animal technician after high school and the other leading to university animal study programs, such as veterinary or biological sciences.

Cinema/Performing Arts (Grades 7-9): This magnet offers a program of instruction in dance, drama, TV, and music. It has been adopted by Francis Ford Coppola and his Zoetrope Studios, as part of the Adopt-A-School program. Each year students who demonstrate aptitude and motivation are chosen by Mr. Coppola for an after-school apprenticeship program. The apprentices, supervised by interns from USC and UCLA, learn to make films using current methods and technology.

Unified Science School (Grades 1-6): Learning experiences are designed to help students understand the significance of science in daily life and to apply the scientific method to problem-solving. Oceanography and physical science laboratories are used to promote science learning.

Fundamental Schools (Grades vary): Fundamental schools stress strict standards for academic achievement, homework, behavior, dress, and personal appearance. Reading, math, language, social studies, and other subjects are taught in a traditional style emphasizing drill, reinforcement, and enrichment. Parents and students must sign a contract agreeing to school-established standards.

Open School (Grades 1-6): This magnet provides an individualized instructional program in a humanistic and a multicultural setting. Teaching methods are based on students' needs and include multi-age and interest groupings, cross-age tutoring, and team teaching. Parent participation and involvement of community resources are stressed in the program.

Gifted and High Ability Centers (Grades 1-6 or 7-9): In these magnet centers, gifted and high ability students are grouped for enriched academic experiences. To qualify, students must be identified as gifted/talented, be achieving two years above grade level in most academic areas, or earn stanine scores of 7, 8, or 9 on standardized achievement tests.

The 86 Magnet programs in operation during 1982-83 served a total of 19,263 students. Table I-3 shows the participation of students of various racial/ethnic backgrounds in the programs as a whole and by grade level configurations. Overall, Black and White students accounted for approximately one-third each of the total enrollment in the Magnet programs. Hispanic students represented about one-fifth of the total magnet population. A similar pattern of participation occurred at the elementary, junior high, and extended grade configuration levels with somewhat higher representation of Black and Hispanic students and somewhat lower participation of White students at the senior high school level.

The subsequent chapters of this report describe the methodology used and the results obtained in the evaluation of the Magnet programs. As noted earlier, this examination focused on the processes used to provide program offerings for participating students, and the progress made toward reducing the court-identified harms of racial isolation.

Table I-3
Student Enrollment in the Magnet Program
1982-83

Grade Level	No. of Schools	American Indian	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Total
Elementary (K-6)	33	1% (81)	34% (2,401)	13% (903)	15% (1,049)	37% (2,559)	(6,993)
Junior High (7-9)	21	1% (40)	27% (1,078)	14% (582)	24% (956)	34% (1,388)	(4,044)
Senior High (10-12)	24	1% (31)	46% (1,832)	9% (350)	25% (987)	20% (804)	(4,004)
Other (Extended grade levels)	9	2% (76)	35% (1,475)	6% (254)	20% (831)	38% (1,586)	(4,222)
Total	**87**	**1%**	**35%**	**11%**	**20%**	**33%**	

Chapter II
Methodology

Purposes and Issues

As noted in the previous chapter, the primary purpose of the evaluation of Magnet programs was to provide information on the processes involved in the implementation of the program and on the progress made in reducing the harms of racial isolation. In defining the "processes" and "harms" to be examined in the study, the Team relied on the stated purpose of the programs, previous findings and formulations, and directions from the Court and District personnel.

The stated purpose of the Magnet programs as derived from an examination of program literature and discussions with program personnel is: to provide a mechanism for voluntary integration focused around special interests. This statement suggests an inquiry into the procedures used to attract students to Magnet programs, the extent and manner in which desegregated environments are created, and the nature of the special interest offerings provided by Magnet programs.

Previous findings and formulations suggested areas of ongoing concern, such as the desegregation status of Magnet programs, and emerging areas of concern, such as the post-secondary advising of magnet students. In other cases, they led the Team to curtailing the collection of data on issues which were judged to have been satisfactorily addressed, such as the fidelity of Magnet programs.

Discussions with District personnel also influenced the types of decisions noted above and influenced the relative emphasis placed on various issues. In particular, District personnel suggested a primary emphasis on program process and implementation since this information would be most useful to them in program planning and management and in responding to the many changes experienced by the District during this time. (See the Prologue to this report for a full discussion of the context in which these activities took place.)

Finally, the Team relied on the direction of the Court in identifying the outcomes, or progress toward the reduction of the harms of racial isolation

to be examined. These areas, identified in the Crawford case, were: 1) academic achievement; 2) attitudes; 3) post-secondary opportunities; and 4) interaction among students of different racial/ethnic groups. The above considerations led to the formulation of a set of evaluation issues to guide the study during 1982-83. (See Table II-1.) Section A presents the issues that were addressed in the process component of the evaluation and Section B identifies the issues that were examined in the outcome component of the study.

It should be noted that the evaluation issues related to process were divided into three main categories: 1) program mechanism and 2) desegregation/integration policies and practices, and 3) school programs. The issues related to program mechanism examined shifts in District procedures for presenting programmatic offerings to parents and students. Further, the ultimate results of the mechanism, that is, the characteristics of participating students and schools, were also delineated. The issues related to desegregation/integration went beyond the assignment of students to examine the policies and procedures that contributed to positive and meaningful integrated interactions both inside and outside the classroom. Furthermore, the importance of staff perceptions and attitudes and actions taken to address ongoing concerns were recognized and targeted for further inquiry. The issue related to school programs considers the administrative or the classroom actions taken to better accommodate the needs of program participants. The issue related to outcomes identified the four harms from the Crawford case and inquired into the degree of progress made toward their reduction.

The evaluation issues provided the conceptual framework for the design of the evaluation methodology. More specifically, they guided decisions about sampling, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis outlined in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

Table II-1
Evaluation Issues

A. Process Evaluation

1. Mechanism(s)

   a. What changes have been made in mechanisms for explaining program options to parents and students during 1982-83?
   b. What are the characteristics of students chosen to participate?
   c. Do program mechanisms result in students being enrolled in desegregated schools?

2. Integration/Desegregation

   a. How do policies and procedures inhibit or contribute to integration?
      1. administration
      2. classroom
      3. extracurricular
   b. What types of services are delivered as part of the program?
   c. What are the perceptions and attitudes of school personnel toward the program?
   d. What additional arrangements have been undertaken during 1982-83 to address particular areas of concern?

B. Outcome Evaluation

1. What progress appears to have been made in reducing the harms set forth in the Crawford decision?
   a. Achievement
   b. Attitudes
   c. Post-secondary opportunities
   d. Social interaction

Sampling

The same sampling strategy used in the 1981-82 study of the Magnet programs was maintained during 1982-83 with a few minor adjustments. This approach allowed continuity and comparability of data over time. The strategy was a multi-level one that allowed the collection of limited demographic data on the entire population of Magnet programs, as well as information on program processes and outcomes from a stratified random sample of Magnet programs. Further, a sub-sample from the identified sample was selected for observation of student interaction.

The census of all 86 Magnet programs was continued as in the previous year. As noted above, this effort was limited to demographic data on school/center characteristics maintained in District records.

The stratified random sample maintained from the previous year was based on three stratification dimensions: type of program, racial/ethnic composition, and grade level configuration. The sampling matrices used to select the sample are shown in Tables II-2, II-3, and II-4 for elementary, junior high, and senior high school programs, respectively. It should be noted that the program-type dimension was based on the specialized offering of the program; that is, whether the specialty was content-oriented (i.e., curriculum-based), process-oriented (i.e., instruction-based), or oriented toward a special population (i.e., student-based).

The racial/ethnic composition dimension included two categories: desegregated or racially impacted. Programs were considered desegregated if the racial/ethnic composition of their students was 40 to 60% PHBAO. They were considered racially impacted if their student body was more than 60% PHBAO. As shown in Tables II-2 to II-4, this strategy resulted in a sample of 44 Magnet programs.

Teachers were also sampled at selected sites based on a random sampling procedure as in the previous year. Two stratification dimensions were used: grade level and academic subject matter. Grade levels identified were: grades 5, 6, 8, and 10. In addition, at the secondary level English and physical education teachers were selected to provide representation across both academic and non-academic subject matters.

As in 1981-82, a sub-sample of the larger sample was identified for observations of student interactions. This sub-sample included 16 programs

randomly selected from the larger sample. This selection was limited to desegregated programs in the sample so that opportunities for intergroup interaction would exist.

The primary modification made in the 1982-83 sampling strategy involved the inclusion of grade 12 students in the two Magnet programs with students at this grade level. This addition was made so that post-secondary plans and opportunities of program participants could be examined. This addition yielded a final sample of 44 Magnet programs.

Table II-2
Sampling Matrix for Elementary Magnet Schools

Program Type	Total Number of Desegregated Magnets	Number Sampled	Total Number of Racially Impacted Magnets	Number Sampled
Content Oriented				
Center for Enriched Studies (N = 3)*	3	1	--	--
Other (N = 10)*	7	3	3	3
Process Oriented				
Alternative (N = 4)*	3	2	1	1
Fundamental (N = 10)*	6	4	4	2
Special Population				
Gifted (N = 12)	9	5	3	1
Highly Gifted (N = 4)	3	2	1	1
Totals	**31**	**17**	**12**	**8**

* A total of ten Extended schools are included in these program types.

Table II-3
Sampling Matrix for Junior High Magnet Schools

Program Type	Total Number of Desegregated Magnets	Number Sampled	Total Number of Racially Impacted Magnets	Number Sampled
Process Oriented				
Fundamental (N = 3)	2	1	1	1
Special Population				
Gifted (N = 8)	5	2	3	1
Highly Gifted (N = 2)	2	1	--	--
Other				
(N = 6)	3	1	3	3
Totals	**12**	**5**	**7**	**5**

Table II-4
Sampling Matrix for Senior High Magnet Schools

Program Type	Total Number of Desegregated Magnets	Number Sampled	Total Number of Racially Impacted Magnets	Number Sampled
College Incentive (N = 8)	--	--	8	3
Math/Science (N = 6)	3	2	3	2
Performing Arts Visual Arts (N = 3)	3	--	--	--
Humanities/Other (N = 7)	2	1	5	1
Totals	**8**	**3**	**16**	**6**

Instrumentation

Specifications for study instrumentation were modified from those used during 1981-82 based on the refinements in the evaluation issues and the relative importance of these issues for the 1982-83 study. These updated specifications are presented in Table II-5.

These specifications required some modification of the instruments used in 1981-82. These instruments included:

- Abstracts: Application Data
  Enrollment Data
- Site Administrator Questionnaire
- Teacher Questionnaire
- College Advisor Questionnaire
- Student Post-Secondary Expectation Questionnaire
- Social Interaction Observation Form
- Published measures for students:
  - Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS)
  - Survey of Essential Skills (SES)
  - District Competency Tests
  - School Attitude Measure (SAM)

The abstracts provided information on the characteristics of students drawn to the programs and the extent to which the selection mechanisms yielded desegregated environments. Questionnaires for site administrators, teachers, and college advisors provided data on policies and practices related to desegregation/integration in general and to specific areas of concern, such as college/career advisement.

The remaining instruments were used to assess student outcomes. Achievement outcomes were measured by tests currently in use as part of the District's regular testing program: the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, the Survey of Essential Skills, and District competency tests. Student attitudes toward school were assessed using the School Attitude Measure (SAM). Post-secondary eligibility and expectations were assessed using a questionnaire developed by the Team for use with Voluntary Integration programs. Finally, the Student Interaction Observation Form was used as a measure of quantity and quality of intergroup interaction.

Table II-5
Instrumentation Specifications for Magnet Programs

Evaluation Issues Addressed	Variables	Measures	Data Source
A. Process Evaluation			
1. Mechanism(s)			
a. What changes have been made in mechanisms for explaining program options to parents and students during 1982-83?	Content and media of program information dissemination	District documents Interview	District administrators
b. What are the characteristics of students chosen to participate?	Race/ethnicity Sex Grade level	Abstract	District documents
c. Do program mechanisms result in students being enrolled in desegregated schools?	Race/ethnicity Sex Grade level	Abstract	District documents
2. Integration/Desegregation			
a. How do policies and procedures inhibit or contribute to integration?	Administrative policies/procedures Classroom practices Extra-classroom practices	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers
b. What types of services are delivered as part of the program?	Nature of services Intensity Duration	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers
c. What are the perceptions and attitudes of school personnel toward the program?	Attitudes toward program	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers

Table II-5 (Continued)
Instrumentation Specifications for Magnet Programs

Evaluation Issues Addressed	Variables	Measures	Data Source
d. What additional arrangements have been undertaken during 1982-83 to address particular areas of concern.	Areas of concern Action undertaken	Questionnaire	Site administrators Teachers
B. Outcome Evaluation			
1. What progress appears to have been made in reducing the harms set forth in the Crawford decision?			
a. Achievement	Basic skills (reading and math)	SES, CTBS	Students
b. Attitudes	Student attitudes	SAM	Students
c. Post-secondary opportunities	Academic preparation	Competency tests	Students
	Post-secondary eligibility	Questionnaire	Students
	Post-secondary expectation	Questionnaire	Students
d. Social behavior of students toward other ethnic groups	Student intergroup relations	Observation form	Schools

Data Collection

Data collection was managed by the LAUSD Reseach and Evaluation Branch staff. These activities were conducted from December through June, as summarized by the schedule presented in Table II-6. Briefly, these tasks included:

- completion of abstracting forms;
- start-up tasks involving notification of the sample and preparation for data collection;
- distribution, collection, and quality control of site Administrator, Teacher, and College Advisor questionnaires;
- completion of observations at each sub-sample school for each specified setting on two separate days;
- distribution, training, collection, and quality control of School Attitude Measure testing and Student Post-Secondary Expectation questionnaire;
- collection of school-level (by grade) summaries of CTBS and SES scores and competency test results.

Analysis

The analysis of information collected during the evaluation of the Magnet programs produced summary indicators of the degree to which the programs were implemented to meet their specified purpose. Additionally, the analysis examined indications of the extent to which progress has been made in reducing the court-identified harms.

The nature of the analyses was largely descriptive with a heavy reliance on frequencies, cross-tabulations, and measures of central tendency and dispersion. Measures of association such as correlation were used to help identify factors related to program success. Where appropriate, comparisons employing techniques such as t-tests or analysis of variance were used to contrast different programmatic features.

Examination of program outcomes, generally, requires the identification of appropriate benchmarks against which the performance of program participants can be compared. In the case of Voluntary Integration programs, such as the Magnet programs, potential conclusions about program outcomes are already tentative due to: the voluntary nature of the programs; the recent

Table II-6
1982-83 Data Collection Schedule for Magnet Programs

Task	Timeline: Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June
Complete abstracts of archival data	Dec.-	Jan.					May - June
Prepare introductory letters to region superintendents			Feb.				
Order SAM materials	Dec.						
Prepare mailing labels and other ancillary data collection materials	Dec.-	Jan.					
Schedule sites for observation		Jan.-	Feb.				
Train observers			Feb.				
Send introductory letters to region superintendents and principals of sampled schools			Feb.				
Distribute and collect Site Administrator, Teacher and College Advisor Questionnaires			Mid-Feb.	-	April		
Conduct observations				March	-	May	
Administer SAM and Post-Secondary Expectation Questionnaire					April		
Quality control and preparation of questionnaires for key punching					April	- May	
Collect District summaries of achievement data						May -	June

establishment of some programs; and recent innovations in some of the more established programs. Thus, given the potential misuses of program and comparison outcome data, only a limited set of comparisons was conducted.

In examining achievement and attitude outcomes, the performance of program participants was compared to that of program cohorts studied in the previous year, to District averages, and to national percentile ranks. These comparisons provided a measure of change over time as well as indications of relative overall standing of program participants.

Results depicting intergroup interaction were compared to those obtained in previous years since the measure used was designed, specifically, for this study and the Team was primarily interested in examining trends over time.

In the reporting of the results, every effort was made to provide concise and readily understandable statements of the findings. Charts, graphs, and other figures needed to convey the analytic results, were used as appropriate.

Chapter III
Findings

This chapter presents the results of the evaluation of the Magnet School programs conducted during 1982-83. The presentation is organized around the three sets of evaluation questions developed for the study. The first two sets of questions focus on program implementation and examine program mechanisms for obtaining student participation and program policies, procedures, and services influencing integration and desegregation. The third set of questions focuses on program outcomes and examines the progress made toward reducing the four harms of racial isolation identified in the Crawford case: achievement, attitudes, post-secondary opportunities, and intergroup interaction.

This study concludes a two-year examination of the Magnet programs conducted by the Voluntary Integration Evaluation Planning Team that began in 1981. During this period, formal data collection using questionnaires, interviews, observations, program documentation, and District records was conducted as described previously. In addition, members of the Team conducted extensive interviews and observations informally over the course of the study. The major results and the professional judgments of team members formulated over the examination of the programs are synthesized in the Evaluation Summary included in the Research and Evaluation Publication 437, Los Angeles Unified School District. The summary also includes recommendations for future actions and directions of the programs.

Program Mechanisms

The first set of questions examined the mechanisms used to solicit and maintain student participation in Magnet programs and the extent to which these mechanisms yielded desegregated enrollments in Magnet programs. These issues were explored through an examination of documents used by the District to disseminate information about the programs to students and parents, interviews with District administrators, and collection of archival data maintained by the District on student enrollment. The results for each evaluation question are presented below.

What changes have been made in mechanisms for explaining program options to parents and students during 1982-83?

The Team's interest in shifts in the District's methods for disseminating information about the programs emerged from the results of a sub-study of parent and student understandings of the programs conducted during 1981-82. Briefly, we found that written materials distributed by the District were the primary source of programmatic information for both parents and students. Further, while the majority of parents and students were very satisfied with the Magnet programs, over half of the parents interviewed were unaware of the various voluntary integration options available to them in the District. At that time, information about these options was distributed in the form of a "Choices" brochure that described Magnet programs and contained an application and a separate form for Permits With Transportation (PWT), the other primary Voluntary Integration program in the District. Each of these documents was fairly complex with readability levels between the ninth and tenth grade levels.

Examination of program documents and interviews with program administrators indicated that some shifts in mechanisms for disseminating information about the programs occurred in 1982-83 and that additional modifications were in progress for the 1983-84 recruitment effort.

The primary change was the combination of the "Choices" brochure and the PWT enrollment form into a single brochure. This brochure, prepared in both English and Spanish, was also called "Choices" and contained information about programs as well as an application that could be used for either the Magnet or the PWT program. However, the descriptions of the programs were quite disproportionate with one page devoted to describing the PWT program and 15 pages to the Magnet programs. A readability analysis of the English version of the brochure using the Dale-Chall and the Flesch readability formulas indicated that the document was written at the eleventh to twelfth grade level.[1] (Procedures were not available to conduct a parallel analysis for the Spanish version; however, it was quite similar to the English version.)

---

[1]We would like to thank Dr. Alan Crawford of the California State University, Los Angeles for conducting this analysis.

The "Choices" brochure was distributed to all students in overcrowded schools. All other schools in the District received 100 copies of the brochure in addition to a one-page flyer that was to be distributed to all students. The flyer, written in English and Spanish, listed the types of magnet school choices and indicated when the brochure would be available at their school.

In addition to the brochures and flyers, information about magnet schools was circulated in both English and Spanish through a half-hour television show aired in the afternoon and early evening, advertisements on television and in local newspapers, and posters in the community. Integration personnel in each region of the District also made presentations informing school advisory committees about the various Magnet programs.

The same mechanisms were instituted to recruit students for the 1983-84 academic year with two exceptions. First, the distribution of the "Choices" brochure was increased so that all students in overcrowded schools and in predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian, and Other non-Anglo (PHBAO) schools received a copy. All other schools in the District received 200 copies for distribution at their discretion. Second, posters were not distributed to community centers to advertise the program.

District administrators identified three problems experienced in disseminating information about the program and soliciting applications. First, they felt that the combined brochure and application were confusing to parents and students. A large volume of phone calls was received asking questions about them and significant numbers of applications were not completed properly. In particular, it was noted that the procedures and criteria for the high achieving, gifted, and highly gifted programs needed to be clarified.

A second area concerned the availability of staff at the District and region levels to inform parents and to answer questions about the programs. Due to budget cutbacks, integration specialists at the region level were reassigned and program personnel at the District level was reduced from five to two staff members. Administrators indicated that this level of staffing was not sufficient to follow-up school recruitment activities, and to answer queries from parents.

Third, program administrators noted the relatively short timeline for distributing the brochures and processing the applications. For example, during 1982-83, one month was allotted for the submission of applications and one week was provided for District staff to process the applications using the District's computer facilities. It was suggested that earlier distribution of the brochure along with longer submission and processing periods would allow for more effective and efficient recruitment.

What are the characteristics of students chosen to participate?

Data on the characteristics of participating students were drawn from District records on student enrollment. Table III-1 summarizes the racial/ethnic backgrounds of all participants in the Magnet programs for the past three years. Three trends are noteworthy. First, the overall student enrollment and the number of participants from each racial/ethnic group has increased over time. Second, when the relative participation rates of the various racial/ethnic groups are compared, Black and White students represent about one-third each of the magnet population, with Hispanic students accounting for about one-fifth of the magnet enrollment. This pattern of participation was also evident in previous years; however, during 1982-83 the percentage of Hispanic participants grew by three percent while the percentage of White participants dropped by three percent compared to the previous year. Both of these shifts are slightly larger than the shifts in the overall representation of these groups in the entire District over these two years. (Hispanic enrollment grew by 1.5% and White enrollment decreased by one percent from 1981-82 to 1982-83.)

Third, when the representation of students of various racial/ethnic backgrounds in the Magnet programs is compared to their respective representation in the District-at-large, Hispanic students are under-represented in the Magnet programs (49% in the District compared to approximately 20% in the Magnet programs). Further, both Black and White students are over-represented (about 21% each in the District compared to about one-third each in the Magnet programs).

The racial/ethnic characteristics of students within the sample of Magnet programs selected for study were also examined in order to verify the representativeness of the sample. Table III-2 shows the characteristics of

Table III-1
Characteristics of Magnet Program Participants
(Total Magnet Population)

Characteristic	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83	
	f*	%	f	%	f	%
American Indian	243	1.55	209	1.30	228	1.20
Asian/Pacific Islander	1,353	8.60	1,659	10.00	2,052	10.70
Black	5,488	34.80	5,907	35.80	6,709	35.10
Hispanic	2,530	16.00	2,785	16.90	3,781	19.80
White	6,172	39.10	5,960	36.10	6,332	33.10
Total	15,786	100.0	16,520	100.00	19,102	100.00

* f denotes frequency

Table III-2
Characteristics of Magnet Sample

Characteristic	Elementary (N=18)		Junior High (N=11)		Senior High (N=8)		Extended (N=4)		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
American Indian	47	1	16	1	5	1	25	1	93	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	547	12	292	13	212	16	116	5	1,167	11
Black	1,629	36	685	30	572	43	910	35	3,796	35
Hispanic	683	15	489	21	270	20	715	28	2,157	20
White	1,618	36	812	35	277	21	833	32	3,540	33
Total	4,524	100	2,294	100	1,336	100	2,599	100	10,753	100

the sample for each grade level configuration. When the representation of the various racial/ethnic groups at each grade level configuration in the sample are compared to that in the population-at-large (see Table I-3), a similar pattern of representation emerges. In the majority of cases, participation rates in the sample fall within three percent of those in the general population. This similarity suggests that the sample selected for inclusion in the study is representative of the population of the Magnet programs, at least in terms of racial/ethnic composition of their student bodies.

Do program mechanisms result in students being enrolled in desegregated schools?

This question was formulated to go beyond the characteristics of participating students to examine the extent to which magnet centers and schools were able to provide desegregated learning environments by drawing students from a diversity of backgrounds to their campuses. Table III-3 summarizes the number and percentage of Magnet programs that met the District-established criteria of PHBAO (more than 60% Hispanic, Black, Asian, and Other non-Anglo), "desegregated" (40-60% PHBAO), and predominantly White (more than 60% White). Several points should be noted. First, only one program fell in the "predominantly White" category. Second, slightly more than half of the elementary programs met the desegregation criterion; however, only about one-third of the programs at the secondary and other configurations were desegregated. The greater proportion of PHBAO magnets at the secondary level appears to be at least partly due to their location. In response to a Court directive allowing the establishment of Magnet programs in PHBAO schools, the District expanded the program over the past three years to include a number of magnet centers on the campuses of PHBAO junior and senior high schools. (Approximately two-thirds of the magnets at these levels are centers located on PHBAO campuses.) Thus, while some Magnet programs succeeded in creating desegregated environments, many were PHBAO programs. The following sets of questions go beyond the enrollment of students in Magnet programs to examine the policies, procedures, and services designed to encourage integrated educational experiences for magnet students.

Table III-3
Centers and Schools in Magnet Program

Level	*PHBAO 61% + PHBAO f	*PHBAO 61% + PHBAO %	Desegregated 40 + 60% White f	Desegregated 40 + 60% White %	White 61% + White f	White 61% + White %	Total
Elementary	15	45.5	17	51.5	1	3.0	33
Junior High	12	63.2	7	36.8	0	0	19
Senior High	17	73.9	6	26.1	0	0	23
Other	6	66.7	3	33.3	0	0	9
Total Magnets	**50**		**33**		**1**		**84**

*Predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian, and Other non-Anglo.

Integration/Desegregation

The following questions focus on the policies and procedures adopted in Magnet programs that encourage or inhibit integrated interactions among students and the types of services that are delivered as part of the Magnet programs. Information in these areas was collected primarily through questionnaires for site administrators and teachers. It should be noted that the focus here was on policies, procedures, and services influencing interaction among students rather than those related to the specialized educational offerings of the Magnet programs. The nature of the specialized educational offerings and the fidelity of programs as implemented to those initially planned were examined in sub-studies conducted in the previous two years.

How do policies and procedures inhibit or contribute to integration?

In order to address this question, administrators were asked about the extent to which policies at their magnet school influenced interaction among students and about actions that had been specifically undertaken at their site to encourage interaction among students of different racial/ethnic groups. As shown in Table III-4, administrators of elementary programs tended to report a strong influence of policies on interaction among students. However, administrators of secondary and extended programs tended to report that student interaction was less influenced by specific policies but more influenced by school personnel and the students themselves. The relatively larger standard deviations for the secondary and extended levels compared to the elementary level indicate that there was more variability on this dimension across secondary and extended programs than across elementary programs. A similar pattern of influence was observed in the previous year; however, responses this year suggest slightly more influence of policies on student interaction across all levels compared to the previous year.

Table III-5 summarizes administrators' reports of actions specifically undertaken to encourage integrated interaction among students. Assignment of students to games and activities was most common at the elementary level; however, almost half of the high school administrators also reported using student assignments to encourage intergroup interaction. Active recruitment for organized activities was most common in secondary and extended programs,

Table III-4
Magnet Programs: Site Policy Influence on Integrated Student Interaction*

Setting	Elementary (N = 29) (K-6)		Junior High (N = 19) (7-9)		Senior High (N = 18) (10-12)		Extended (N = 14) (K-12)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Recess/nutrition	1.12	0.44	2.44	0.92	2.56	0.86	2.57	0.85
Lunch/cafeteria	1.04	0.21	2.53	0.84	2.33	0.97	2.57	0.85
Lunch/outside eating area	1.21	0.59	2.53	0.84	2.33	0.97	2.45	0.93
Lunch/playground	1.12	0.44	2.61	0.78	2.50	0.86	2.45	0.93

*On a three point scale measuring the structure provided by site policy to influence student interaction where 1 = totally governed by school-wide policy, 2 = discretion of school personnel, and 3 = no influence by site policy (i.e., totally governed by students).

Table III-5
Magnet Programs: Administrator Reports of Actions Taken to Encourage Intergroup Interaction

Type of Action	Elementary (K-6)		Junior High (7-9)		Senior High (10-12)		Extended (K-12)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Assignment to games/activities	19	65.52	4	21.05	8	44.44	4	28.57
Active recruitment for organized activities	12	41.38	15	78.95	15	88.33	10	71.43
Inservice training	17	58.62	12	63.16	4	22.22	8	57.14
Modification of school policies	3	10.35	3	15.79	4	22.22	2	14.29
Restructuring features of physical setting	1	3.45	2	10.53	2	11.11	0	0.00
Other	3	10.35	19	100.00	6	33.33	3	21.43

although about two-fifths of the elementary administrators also reported use of this practice. Inservice training was also a commonly reported technique, although somewhat less in the high school programs. These activities were also the most frequently reported actions taken during 1981-82 as well. The major difference between the two years occurred in the relatively lower incidence of inservice training at the high school level during 1982-83 (50% of the programs in 1981-82 vs. 22% in 1982-83.)

In summary, actions were commonly taken in the Magnet programs sampled to encourage interaction among students of different racial/ethnic backgrounds. Site policies were reported to particularly influence interaction among students in elementary programs.

What types of services are delivered as part of the program?

Both administrators and teachers were asked about services delivered to students, school staff, and parents as part of the Magnet programs. Administrators' reports of services provided for students by the school are summarized in Table III-6. Most of the services identified were reported by the majority of administrators, particularly at the secondary and extended levels. A similar pattern of responses was obtained during 1981-82; however, these services tended to be slightly more frequent during 1982-83.

Teachers' reports of classroom practices for students are summarized in Table III-7. Again, the majority of teachers reported the use of most classroom practices identified on the questionnaire. The least frequent practices were the buddy system and parent meetings at the high school level. All other practices were generally reported by over half of the teachers and in many cases by over three-quarters of the teachers. A similar pattern of services was reported by teachers in 1981-82.

Teachers' reports of activities for school staff are summarized in Table III-8. Staff meetings were common at all levels. Inservice training and sample letters for parents were the next most frequently reported activities. While these three activities were also the most commonly reported by teachers in 1981-82, inservice training was reported much less frequently in 1982-83 as compared to the previous year. (In 1982-83, the percentage of teachers across levels reporting inservice training ranged from 33-47%. In 1981-82, the range was 57-90%.)

Table III-6
Magnet Programs: Administrator Reports of School Practices

Type of Service	Elementary (K-6)		Junior High (7-9)		Senior High (10-12)		Extended (K-12)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Orientation programs	27	93.10	19	100.00	18	100.00	13	92.86
Buddy system	11	37.93	5	26.32	3	16.67	7	50.00
Tutorial services	17	58.62	17	89.47	18	100.00	12	85.17
Curriculum enrichment	26	89.66	18	94.74	18	100.00	14	100.00
Specialized instructional approaches	26	89.66	18	94.74	16	88.89	10	71.43
Auxiliary transportation	15	51.72	18	94.74	16	88.89	10	71.43
Guidance-counseling	18	62.07	19	100.00	18	100.00	14	100.00
Needs assessment	25	86.21	16	84.21	14	77.78	13	92.86
Additional supervisory personnel	12	41.38	12	63.16	8	44.44	8	57.14
Special activities to encourage interaction	27	93.10	18	94.74	18	100.00	14	100.00
Special activities to encourage intergroup understanding	24	82.76	16	84.21	16	88.89	14	100.00
Inclusion in formal evaluation	18	62.07	16	94.21	16	88.89	13	92.86
Survey for suggestions	14	48.28	17	89.47	15	83.33	12	85.71
Other	8	27.57	1	5.26	3	16.67	14	100.00

Table III-7
Magnet Programs: Teacher Reports of Classroom Practices

Type of Practice	Elementary (K-6)		Junior High (7-9)		Senior High (10-12)		Extended (K-12)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Racially/ethnically mixed seating arrangement	67	89.33	41	89.13	32	84.21	29	80.56
Racially/ethnically mixed grouping arrangement	66	88.00	32	69.57	32	84.21	29	80.56
Cooperative work groups	71	94.67	34	73.91	29	76.32	34	94.44
Intergroup interaction activities	71	94.67	34	73.91	22	57.90	31	86.11
Curriculum enrichment	72	96.00	30	65.22	21	55.26	28	77.78
Specialized instructional approach	68	90.67	34	73.91	24	63.16	29	80.56
Buddy system	53	70.67	21	45.65	12	31.58	21	58.33
Communication with parents	75	100.00	43	93.48	30	78.95	33	91.67
Meetings with parents	74	98.67	41	89.13	32	34.21	32	88.89
Classroom orientation program	63	84.00	30	65.22	23	60.53	25	69.44
Tutorial arrangements	43	57.33	26	56.52	28	73.68	25	69.44
Intergroup understanding activities	61	81.33	27	58.70	17	44.74	26	72.22
Needs assessment	68	90.67	35	76.09	28	73.68	27	75.00
Other	4	5.33	6	13.04	4	10.53	5	13.89

Table III-8
Magnet Programs: Teacher Reports
of Activities for School Staff

Type of Activity	Elementary (K-6) (N = 75)		Junior High (7-9) (N = 46)		Senior High (10-12) (N = 38)		Extended (K-12) (N = 36)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Inservice training	35	46.67	15	32.61	13	34.21	13	36.11
Visits to other successful magnets	9	12.00	5	10.87	3	7.90	7	19.44
Language Acquisition Program	12	16.00	3	6.52	2	5.26	5	13.89
Sample parent letters with translations	41	54.67	23	50.00	17	44.74	11	30.56
Staff meetings	64	85.33	34	73.91	31	81.58	26	70.22
Other	4	5.33	9	19.57	7	18.42	3	8.33

Administrators reported on services provided for parents (summarized in Table III-9). School meetings and special communications were reported by close to 90% or more of the administrators at each level. Surveys for suggestions were also common, and accessible scheduling of special activities was noted by the majority of administrators particularly at the secondary and extended levels. Similar activities for parents were reported in 1981-82, with one noteworthy exception. During 1982-83, all 19 junior high magnets sampled instituted a Neighborhood Homes program.

In summary, a variety of activities were reported for students, school staff, and parents by both teachers and administrators. These activities were similar to those reported in the previous year with two exceptions. Inservice training was reported less frequently in 1982-83 than in 1981-82. A service for parents involving identifying neighborhood homes for students to be called upon in the case of illness or other emergencies was set up in all junior high school magnets sampled during 1982-83.

What are the perceptions and attitudes of school personnel toward the program?

Both administrators and teachers were asked for their perceptions of the effect of their Magnet program on students and their parents in a variety of academic, social, and extracurricular areas. (See Table III-10.) The average ratings for both administrators and teachers are generally quite high indicating that they both view the services provided by the Magnet program as moderately to very effective in a variety of areas. The primary exception occurred in the area of participation in after-school activities in both elementary and extended programs. Services were viewed as much less effective in this area, a finding that emerged during the previous two years as well.

Teachers and administrators also tended to have similar positive views in the previous two years. However, in the past teachers in junior high, senior high, and extended programs indicated less success in securing parental participation in their Magnet program. During 1982-83, their responses were markedly more positive in this area suggesting improvements in reaching parents and encouraging their participation.

Table III-9
Magnet Programs: Activities for Parents

Type of Activity	Elementary (K-6)		Junior High (7-9)		Senior High (10-12)		Extended (K-12)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
School meetings	27	93.10	17	89.47	16	88.89	14	100.00
Special communications	28	96.55	18	94.74	18	100.00	14	100.00
Community liaison	15	51.72	11	57.90	6	33.33	12	85.71
Accessible scheduling of special activities	10	34.48	11	57.90	15	83.33	12	85.71
Survey for suggestions	24	82.76	13	68.42	10	55.56	14	100.00
Late afternoon phone service	10	34.48	8	42.11	7	38.89	10	71.43
Meetings in sending area	4	13.79	4	21.05	6	33.33	5	35.71
Neighborhood Homes Program	1	3.45	19	100.00	1	5.56	3	21.43
Other	4	13.79	19	100.00	4	22.22	1	7.14

Table III-10
Magnet Programs: Perceptions of Student and Parent Success

Area of Impact	Administrators		Teachers	
	Mean*	SD	Mean	SD
Elementary School				
Overall school adjustment	4.79	0.41	4.57	0.64
Academic achievement (marks)	4.52	0.63	4.17	0.69
Academic progress	4.66	0.48	4.35	0.67
Peer acceptance	4.72	0.45	4.39	0.74
Interaction with other students	--	--	4.09	0.86
Participation in extra-curricular activities	4.21	0.73	--	--
Participation in after-school activities	--	--	2.57	1.18
Parental communication	4.83	0.48	4.51	0.74
Parental participation	4.59	0.63	4.29	0.71
Junior High				
Overall school adjustment	4.74	0.45	4.24	1.04
Academic performance (marks)	4.37	0.60	4.05	0.71
Academic progress	4.47	0.61	4.05	0.71
Peer acceptance	4.74	0.45	4.41	0.80
Interaction with other students	--	--	4.16	0.95
Participation in extra-curricular activities	4.47	0.90	--	--
Participation in after-school activities	--	--	3.90	1.06
Parental communication	4.58	0.61	4.27	0.75
Parental participation	4.21	0.85	4.07	0.76
Use of college/course advisement services	4.20	0.84	--	--

*On a five point scale where 1 = little or no effect, 3 = some effect, and 5 = very effective.

Table III-10 (continued)
Magnet Programs: Perceptions of Parent and Student Sucess

Area of Impact	Administrators		Teachers	
	Mean*	SD	Mean	SD
Senior High				
Overall school adjustment	4.78	0.43	4.11	1.02
Academic performance (marks)	4.33	0.77	3.86	0.87
Academic improvement	4.06	0.87	3.95	0.97
Peer acceptance	4.78	0.43	4.19	1.31
Interaction with other students	--	--	4.17	1.06
Participation in extra-curricular activities	4.39	0.61	--	--
Participation in after-school activities	--	--	3.81	1.06
Parental communication	4.78	0.55	3.82	1.06
Parental participation	3.82	1.29	3.35	0.98
Use of college/course advisement services	4.61	0.61	--	--
Pre-registration of courses	4.72	0.52	--	--
Extended School				
Overall school adjustment	4.43	0.65	4.50	0.74
Academic performance	4.36	0.50	3.89	0.62
Peer acceptance	4.43	0.51	4.09	0.66
Participation in social activities	4.64	0.50	4.34	0.80
Interaction with other students	--	--	4.25	0.81
Participation in extra-curricular activities	3.33	1.11	--	--
Participation in after-school activities	--	--	2.21	1.50

*On a five point scale where 1 = little or no effect, 3 = some effect, and 5 = very effective.

Table III-10 (continued)
Magnet Programs: Perception of Parent and Student Success

Area of Impact	Administrators		Teachers	
	Mean*	SD	Mean	SD
Extended School				
Parental communication	4.43	1.56	4.00	0.86
Parental participation	4.00	1.18	3.75	1.00
Use of college/course advisement services	3.70	1.16	--	--
Pre-registration of courses	4.62	0.65	--	--

*On a five point scale where 1 = little or no effect, 3 = some effect, and 5 = very effective.

Thus, administrators and teachers continued their positive views of the Magnet programs during 1982-83. While encouraging participation of students in elementary and extended magnets continued to be perceived as a problem area, parental participation was viewed as more effectively secured during 1982-83 as compared to previous years.

What arrangements have been undertaken during 1982-83 to address particular areas of concern?

Three areas of concern were targeted for inquiry during 1982-83 based on the findings of previous studies and discussions with District and program personnel. They were: after-school participation, counseling services for secondary students, and suggested modifications to the program.

As noted earlier, student participation in after-school activities has consistently emerged as an area of least success in elementary and extended magnets. In order to investigate this issue further, administrators were asked about actions that had been undertaken in their programs specifically to encourage participation in after-school activities. Interestingly, almost 90% of the administrators in secondary magnets and 80% of those in the extended magnets reported additional transportation arrangements for after-school activities. These rates are about twice as high as the previous year (about 40%). In contrast, only 24% of the administrators in sampled elementary magnets reported additional transportation arrangements (a reduction of almost half of the 40% reporting such arrangements in 1981-82).

Since post-secondary opportunities are one of the four Court-identified harms of racial isolation, the nature and use of college counseling services for magnet students and their parents were targeted for inquiry. Table III-11 summarizes counseling services reported for students and parents, respectively, by college advisors in sampled senior high Magnet programs. All students were reported to receive individual counseling and to meet with a counselor on college entrance requirements. In addition, over two-thirds or more of the students in secondary Magnets were reported to participate on the average in a variety of other activities. However, the relatively large standard deviations suggest that there is considerable variability in participation across programs.

Table III-11
College Counseling Services
for Magnet Students and Parents

Services	Mean % Participating	SD
Students		
Individual counseling	100.00	0.00
Meetings with college representatives	95.00	6.32
Meetings with counselor on college entrance requirements	100.00	0.00
Meetings or classes on college entrance exams	87.14	22.15
Meetings on career choices	85.83	23.75
Career day with guest speakers	70.00	42.43
Meetings on financial aid	89.17	17.44
Field trips on college campuses	63.75	14.93
Workshops on learning/study skills	75.00	35.36
Parents		
Individual counseling	68.88	32.06
Meetings with college representatives	34.50	32.10
Meetings with counselor on college entrance requirements	48.57	35.80
Meetings or classes on college entrance exams	46.17	38.19
Meetings on career choices	45.50	49.57
Career day with guest speakers	38.50	51.62
Meetings on financial aid	61.67	33.27
Field trips on college campuses	55.00	7.07
Workshops on learning/study skills	62.50	53.03

Parents of magnet students tend to participate at lower rates than their children, however, about two-thirds of the parents, on the average, were reported to receive individual counseling, meetings on financial aid, and workshops on learning and study skills. Again, the relatively large standard deviations indicate that parent participation varied considerably across programs.

Finally, administrators and teachers were asked for suggestions about modifications needed to improve their Magnet program. Administrators, in particular, tended to note the need for additional resources and equipment. The need for better screening of students was also frequently noted as an area requiring action.

What progress appears to have been made in reducing the harms set forth in the Crawford decision?

The final set of evaluation issues concerned the outcomes of the Magnet programs. In particular, progress made in reducing the four harms of racial isolation identified in the Crawford decision--achievement, attitudes, post-secondary opportunities, and social behavior of groups--was examined. Data on achievement, attitudes, and social behavior were also available for target grade levels at sampled schools for the previous year, allowing an examination of trends over time. In addition, District averages and national percentiles were available for achievement and attitude data to serve as benchmarks for comparison. Data on post-secondary opportunities were collected for the first time during 1982-83 due to the recent establishment of Magnet programs at the senior high school level and the small number of 12th grade students enrolled.

Achievement. The achievement of magnet students in sampled programs was examined using data collected as part of the District's regular testing program: The Survey of Essential Skills (SES) for grades 5 and 6 and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) for grade 8. The former is a criterion-referenced measure of achievement with District established criteria for mastery. The latter is a norm-referenced measure normed on a national sample of students.

Table III-12 summarizes the performance of magnet students in sampled programs for Spring, 1983 testing. Looking at the SES results first, it can be seen that students, on the average, answered 80% or more of the items correctly on the reading, math, and composition tests at both grade levels. A similar pattern of performance was observed the previous year. These levels of performance are consistently above the average performance levels of students in the District at large on all three tests at both grade levels (see Table III-13). Further, when the average performance of students in different types of Magnet programs was examined, it can be seen that students in the highly gifted, gifted, fundamental, and the math/science programs tended to show higher levels of achievement, on the average, than those in alternative, CES, or other content programs. However, the average performance of all students in all program types exceeded the District-established mastery criterion of 52%. (See Table III-14.)

At the eighth grade, magnet students in sampled programs performed at the 65th national percentile in reading and the 59th national percentile in math on the CTBS. These levels of performance were slightly improved from last year (nine percentile points in reading and two percentile points in math). Further, these average performance levels are above the District-wide averages. When the performance of magnet students was examined separately by type of programs as shown in Table III-15 , average performance in all types of programs was above the District average in reading and math with two exceptions: the math/science type on the reading test, and the alternative type on the math test.

In summary, the average achievement of magnet students in grades 5,6, and 8 in sampled Magnet programs was consistently above that of students in the District-at-large. Furthermore, when the average performance of students in different types of programs was examined, these averages surpassed the District-established mastery criteria on the SES for all program types at both grades 5 and 6. At grade 8, the average performance of students in different types of programs exceeded District averages with two exceptions. Thus, the consistently higher performance of students in Magnet programs is not accounted for solely by students in highly gifted and gifted programs but can be seen in other types of programs as well.

Table III-12
Magnet Schools

I. Survey of Essential Skills (SES)
Results: Grades 5 and 6

	Reading			Mathematics			Composition		
	Mean Raw Score	SD	Mean Percent Correct	Mean Raw Score	SD	Mean Percent Correct	Mean Raw Score	SD	Mean Percent Correct
Grade 5 (N=23)	38.19	2.37	86.80	44.90	7.44	80.18	38.76	3.92	88.09
Grade 6 (N=22)	43.89	4.29	91.44	38.40	6.73	80.00	30.56	3.27	84.89

II. Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS)
Results: Grade 8

	Reading			Mathematics		
	Mean Raw Score	SD	NP*	Mean Raw Score	SD	NP
Grade 8 (N=16)	60.88	11.15	65	73.19	16.19	59

*National Percentile

Table III-13
Comparison of Magnet and District Achievement Levels SES (Mean Percent Correct)

	Reading	Mathematics	Composition
Grade 5			
Magnet Sample	87	80	88
District-Wide	78	72	78
Grade 6			
Magnet Sample	91	80	85
District-Wide	83	70	76

CTBS (Percentiles)

	Reading	Mathematics
Grade 8		
Magnet Sample	65	59
District-Wide	42	50

Table III-14
Magnet School: Achievement on the Survey of Essential Skills by Program Type

	Reading Raw Score		Mathematics Raw Score		Composition Raw Score	
District-Established Mastery Criteria						
Grade 5	23		29		23	
Grade 6	25		25		19	
Magnet Programs	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
Highly Gifted						
Grade 5 (N=1)	42.85	--	52.85	--	42.77	--
Grade 6 (N=1)	47.94	--	47.44	--	35.75	--
Gifted						
Grade 5 (N=8)	41.37	1.33	50.17	1.00	41.81	0.93
Grade 6 (N=8)	46.42	1.11	43.20	2.20	32.72	0.98
Fundamental						
Grade 5 (N=4)	38.71	1.29	46.56	2.94	39.09	0.88
Grade 6 (N=4)	44.13	1.86	38.99	2.47	30.30	1.39
Alternative						
Grade 5 (N=5)	34.22	4.57	37.48	6.95	33.97	4.54
Grade 6 (N=5)	39.39	5.87	30.22	6.68	26.87	3.41
CES						
Grade 5 (N=1)	28.00	--	29.00	--	38.00	--
Grade 6 (N=1)	45.39	--	35.06	--	31.28	--
Other Content						
Grade 5 (N=2)	36.70	5.65	42.98	10.29	36.41	3.79
Grade 6 (N=2)	40.84	6.02	34.81	8.86	28.06	4.26
Math/Science						
Grade 5 (N=1)	38.95	--	45.06	--	38.44	--
Grade 6 (N=1)	45.15	--	40.01	--	31.86	--

Table III-15
Magnet School: Achievement on the
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS)

Magnet Program Type (Grade 8)	Reading Mean	Reading SD	Reading NP	Mathmatics Mean	Mathmatics SD	Mathmatics NP
Gifted (N=5)	62.52	9.44	56	78.50	16.09	65
Highly Gifted (N=1)	79.11	0.00	94	93.9	0.00	94
Fundamental (N=2)	67.40	9.05	65	82.50	10.61	72
Other Content (N=3)	54.17	13.33	44	65.00	6.08	52
Math/Science (N=1)	46.9	--	35	88.0	--	83
CES (N=1)	68.3	--	67	78.5	--	65
Alternative	56.67	10.12	48	52.73	11.45	41

Attitudes. The attitudes toward school of students in Magnet programs were assessed using the School Attitude Measure (SAM) published by Scott-Foresman. This measure, also used during the previous year, contains five sub-scales: 1) motivation for schooling, 2) academic self-concept, performanced-based, 3) academic self-concept, referenced-based, 4) sense of control over performance, and 5) instructional mastery.

Table III-16 summarizes the performance of magnet students sampled during 1982-83 on the SAM. Students in elementary, junior high, and senior high magnets tended to score consistently above the 50th percentile on all five sub-scales. However, students in programs with extended grade level configurations (K-12) tended to score consistently below their counterparts in the same grade levels on all five sub-scales. This pattern was observed during the previous year as well. Programs with extended grade configurations are alternative schools. It is unclear whether the consistently lower attitudes of students in alternative programs is a reaction to this particular type of program or a function of the type of students who are drawn to alternative school programs.

Table III-17 presents the changes in the performance of magnet students sampled at target grades from 1981-82 to 1982-83. The entries in the table indicate the differences in mean sub-scale scores over the two-year period. As can be seen from the table, average student performance generally shifted less than one or two score points from 1981-82 to 1982-83. Since such fluctuations are expected due to measurement error,[1] one can conclude that the attitudes of sampled magnet students were relatively stable over this two-year time period.

Post-Secondary Opportunities. The post-secondary opportunities of magnet students was a new area of inquiry in 1982-83. This harm had not been examined before due to the recent establishment of high school Magnet programs and the extremely small number of 12th grade students enrolled. While most senior high school magnets still had few 12th grade students enrolled during 1982-83, two programs in the District contained sufficient numbers of seniors to make the examination of post-secondary opportunities feasible.

---

[1] The standard errors of measurement for the SAM sub-scales tend to cluster around 3.5 score points.

Table III-16
Magnet Schools: School Attitude Measure (SAM) Performance

	Motivation for Schooling			Academic Self-Concept--Performance Based			Academic Self-Concept--Reference Based			Sense of Control Over Performance			Instructional Mastery		
Grade Level	Mean	SD	NP*	Mean	SD	NP	Mean	SD	NP	Mean	SD	NP	Mean	SD	NP
Elementary (N=19)															
Grade 5	48.53	1.95	63	41.79	2.07	61	41.26	2.35	62	46.42	1.80	72	47.00	2.19	67
Grade 6	47.53	2.34	57	42.26	1.88	64	42.21	1.87	67	46.42	2.61	60	46.63	2.24	66
Junior High (N=11)															
Grade 9	53.09	2.43	56	46.64	2.11	56	47.73	2.24	59	50.64	2.38	56	47.73	2.74	55
Senior High (N=9)															
Grade 10	64.11	2.52	64	57.00	1.73	70	55.33	1.94	71	66.22	1.64	67	59.44	1.51	66
Extended Schedule (N=5)															
Grade 5	45.00	1.58	44	39.80	2.17	46	39.40	1.52	48	43.00	0.71	50	43.60	1.67	54
Grade 6	44.80	2.17	42	39.80	1.30	45	41.00	2.12	60	44.20	2.39	46	44.00	2.33	48
Grade 9	49.40	2.19	38	46.00	0.71	52	48.00	1.58	60	49.60	1.14	51	47.20	1.22	51
Grade 10	60.50	3.70	66	56.50	1.91	68	55.00	2.00	70	65.50	1.32	64	58.25	1.50	63

*National Percentile

Magnet Schools: Changes in Performance on the School Attitude Measure from 1981-82 to 1982-83*

Grade Level	Motivation for Schooling	Academic Self-Concept--Performance Based	Academic Self-Concept--Reference Based	Sense of Control Over Performance	Instructional Mastery
Elementary (N=18)					
Grade 5	1.14	-0.10	-0.52	0.59	0.17
Grade 6	0.14	-0.13	-0.12	-0.75	-0.26
Junior High (N=11)					
Grade 8	0.36	0.28	0.46	0.11	0.64
Senior High (N=9)					
Grade 10	0.89	0.89	0.55	0.66	1.00
Extended Schedule (N=5)					
Grade 5	0.40	-0.80	-0.80	-0.20	-0.60
Grade 6	-0.20	-1.40	-0.40	-1.60	-1.40
Grade 8	-1.20	-0.40	-0.20	-1.20	-0.40
Grade 10	3.00	1.75	1.25	2.00	2.00

*Entries in table are differences between mean sub-mean scale scores from 1981-82 to 1982-83.

Table III-18 summarizes the responses of sampled 12th grade students to a questionnaire on their academic preparation and post-secondary plans. Twenty-nine students representing 37% of the 12th grade students at the two sampled schools were selected based on their access and availability.

Almost all of the students sampled reported that they expected to receive a high school diploma in June, 1983. Further, when asked about their plans after high school, about 70% indicated that they expected to pursue some type of post-secondary education. In fact, over half of the students reported that they planned to attend a four-year college.

While most students reported that they planned to pursue a post-secondary education, it was difficult to assess their level of preparation from their responses on the questionnaire. Since only seven students reported that they had taken the SAT and provided their scores, estimates of UC and CSU eligibility could not be computed. Without SAT performance, it is difficult to assess the contribution of completion of college preparatory courses and high school GPA, since most post-secondary institutions take all three indicators into account in determining eligibility and admission.

Social behavior toward other ethnic groups. The behavior of students toward those of other ethnic backgrounds was observed using an observation form that had been used with success for the previous two years. Observations were conducted during recess/nutrition, in the lunchroom/cafeteria, and outside eating areas, and on the playground after lunch. The observational protocol collected information on the ethnic make-up of students in the observational situation and the extent and friendliness of intergroup interaction. Observers also indicated the influence of situational and environmental features on interaction.

Table III-19 summarizes the observations of social interaction. At the elementary level, situations observed tended to be composed of about one-third White students and about two-thirds PHBAO students, with the exception of the lunchroom/cafeteria which tended to include predominantly PHBAO students. On the average, the majority of both White and PHBAO students tended to be involved in intergroup interaction and observers rated the interaction as quite friendly and warm. It is also noteworthy that observers considered these situations as encouraging social interaction among students.

Table III-18
Magnet Schools:
12th Grade Student Academic Preparation and Post-Secondary Plans

High School Diploma (June 1982)	Frequency	%
Yes	27	93.10
No	0	0.00
Not Sure	2	6.90
Number taking Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)	7	24.14
College Preparatory Courses		
Years of History	1.81	0.19
Years of English	2.35	0.40
Years of Mathematics	2.06	0.37
Years of Laboratory Science	1.44	0.10
Years of Foreign Language	1.75	0.75
Academic Achievement		
High School GPA (N=25)	2.56	30.21
SAT Performance - Verbal (N=7)	525.00	21.21
- Mathematics (N=7)	511.66	44.78
Plans After High School		
Full-time job	4	15.39
Attend a technical school	0	0.00
Attend a 2-year community college	4	15.39
Attend a UC campus	4	15.39
Attend a CSUC campus	3	11.54
Attend a 4-year public college	1	3.85
Attend a private 4-year college	6	23.08
Other	4	15.39

Table III-19
Magnet Schools:
Observations of Social Interaction

Grade Level Setting	Percent Whites in Setting		Percent PHBAO in Setting		Extent of White Intergroup Interaction*		Extent of PHBAO Intergroup Interaction*		Friendliness of Interaction**		Influence of Situation on Social Interaction	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean*	SD	Mean*	SD	Mean	SD	Mean***	SD
Elementary Level												
Recess/nutrition	28.38	25.34	71.63	25.34	3.75	1.89	4.25	1.50	4.63	0.48	4.63	0.48
Lunchroom/cafeteria	7.50	3.54	92.50	3.54	3.00	2.83	3.50	2.12	4.50	0.71	4.50	0.71
Lunch/outside eating area	34.50	24.25	65.50	24.25	4.67	0.29	4.83	0.29	4.83	0.29	4.67	0.29
Playground after lunch	27.13	24.70	72.88	24.70	3.88	1.93	4.13	1.44	4.63	0.48	4.50	0.41
Junior High Level												
Recess/nutrition	30.00	8.16	68.75	6.29	2.13	1.65	2.25	1.66	4.13	0.25	3.50	1.00
Lunchroom/cafeteria	30.00	0.00	70.00	0.00	4.75	0.35	4.75	0.35	4.75	0.35	4.50	0.00
Lunch/outside eating area	29.50	6.22	69.50	4.47	2.50	1.87	2.60	1.82	4.20	0.45	3.50	0.71
Playground after lunch	29.50	6.22	69.50	4.47	2.60	1.78	2.80	1.64	4.20	0.45	3.50	0.71
Between periods	30.00	7.07	69.00	5.48	2.60	1.98	2.70	1.92	4.20	0.27	3.50	0.71
Senior High Level												
Recess/nutrition	50.50	31.11	49.50	31.11	3.00	0.71	3.75	1.77	3.75	1.77	1.75	0.35
Lunchroom/cafeteria	12.50	0.00	87.50	0.00	3.50	2.12	1.75	0.35	3.75	1.06	1.25	0.35
Lunch/outside eating area	46.00	19.80	54.00	19.80	2.50	0.71	2.50	0.71	3.75	1.06	2.25	0.35
Playground after lunch	35.00	35.36	65.00	35.36	2.25	1.06	2.25	1.06	3.50	0.71	2.75	1.06
Between periods	62.50	38.89	37.50	38.89	3.75	1.77	3.75	1.77	4.00	1.41	3.50	0.71

* "1" = none or almost none, "2" = few, "3" = some, "4" = many, and "5" = all or almost all
** "1" = hostile, "2" = distant/cool, "3" = mixed, "4" = somewhat friendly/warm, and "5" = very friendly/warm
*** "1" = greatly hinder, "2" = somewhat hinder, "3" = no influence, "4" = somewhat encourage, "5" = greatly encourage

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE III-19
Magnet Schools:
Observations of Social Interaction (Continued)

Grade Level Setting	Percent Whites in Setting		Percent PHBAO in Setting		Extent of White Intergroup Interaction		Extent of PHBAO Intergroup Interaction		Friendliness of Interaction		Influence of Situation on Social Interaction	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean*	SD	Mean*	SD	Mean**	SD	Mean***	SD
Extended Level (K-12)												
Recess/nutrition	34.00	16.55	68.50	13.87	2.63	1.11	2.65	0.96	4.25	0.29	4.13	0.85
Lunch/outside eating area	34.00	16.55	67.25	15.06	2.13	0.85	1.63	0.75	4.00	0.41	3.25	0.96
Playground after lunch	32.75	15.06	67.25	15.06	2.13	0.85	1.75	0.65	4.25	0.29	3.13	0.18
Between periods	33.75	9.46	66.25	9.46	1.75	0.96	1.75	0.96	3.38	0.95	3.00	0.82

* "1" = none or almost none, "2" = few, "3" = some, "4" = many, and "5" = all or almost all
** "1" = hostile, "2" = distant/cool, "3" = mixed, "4" = somewhat friendly/warm, and "5" = very friendly/warm
*** "1" = greatly hinder, "2" = somewhat hinder, "3" = no influence, "4" = somewhat encourage, "5" = greatly encourage

At the junior high level, situations observed also tended to be about 30% White students and about 70% PHBAO students. Except for the lunchroom/cafeteria, fewer students tended to be involved in intergroup interactions; however, observers rated the interaction that did occur as warm and friendly. It is interesting to note that the lunchroom/cafeteria, where the greatest amount of interaction was observed at this level, was rated by observers as more encouraging of interaction than the other situations observed.

Observations at the senior high level yielded similar results as the junior high level; however, there was more variability across situations in the percentages of White and PHBAO students. Moderate amounts of intergroup interaction were observed which tended to be positive. It is noteworthy that observers tended to view situations as hindering rather than encouraging interaction on the average.

Observations in extended programs were similar to the junior high programs observed. Situations tended to be composed of about 35% White students and about 65% PHBAO students. Less than half of the White and PHBAO students tended to be involved in intergroup interaction; however, the integrated interactions that did occur were viewed as warm and friendly. Situational features were viewed as positive contributors to social interaction in extended programs.

Observations of social interaction conducted in 1981-82 were consistent with those summarized in Table III-19 for 1982-83. At the elementary level, intergroup interaction was frequent and friendly. In junior high, senior high, and extended programs, fewer students were engaged in intergroup interaction; however, when integrated interactions occurred they also tended to be positive. The less extensive interaction among students of different ethnic backgrounds in junior and senior high programs is at least partly a function of the opportunity available for intergroup interaction. Since most of these programs operate as centers on PHBAO campuses, there is less opportunity for integrated interactions.

The preceding chapter presented a summary of the results of the 1982-83 evaluation of Magnet programs. These findings were organized around the three major sets of evaluation questions developed for the study concerning program mechanisms, integration/desegregation, and program outcomes.

Major Findings

The major findings of the two-year study of Magnet programs can be organized around five areas: (1) mechanisms for obtaining student participation; (2) the extent of desegregated enrollments in Magnet programs; (3) policies, procedures, and services contributing to integrated educational experiences for students; (4) fidelity of specialized educational offerings as implemented, to initial plans; and (5) progress toward reducing the court-identified harms of racial isolation. The first four areas relate to program processes or implementation while the latter concerns outcomes of the program.

Program Mechanism. The first set of findings concern the mechanisms used to solicit and maintain student participation in Magnet programs and the extent to which these mechanisms yielded desegregated enrollments in Magnet programs. Briefly, we found that:

- While the District disseminates information about the program using a variety of media (e.g., brochures, television, posters), written materials distributed at school for students to share with their parents were the primary source of programmatic information for both students and parents.
- During 1981-82, separate brochures and applications were distributed for the Magnet and Permits With Transportation (PWT) programs, the two primary Voluntary Integration programs in the District. These materials, available in both English and Spanish, were written at the 9th to 10th grade reading level. During 1982-83, a combined brochure and application were prepared, with one page of the brochure devoted to the PWT program and 15 pages to the Magnet programs. These materials, again available in both English and Spanish, were written at the 11th to 12th grade reading level. District administrators felt that the combined format was confusing to parents.
- During 1982-83, distribution of programmatic information was targeted to all students in overcrowded schools. All other schools in the District received 100 copies of the brochure in addition to a one page flyer distributed to all students. This procedure was modified for 1982-83 recruitment so that all students in overcrowded and predominantly Hispanic,

Black, Asian, and Other non-Anglo (PHBAO) schools received the brochures. All other schools received 200 copies of the brochure and flyers for all students.

- Efficient and timely processing of program applications and parent inquiries was hampered by cutbacks in District and region personnel assigned to the Magnet programs and the relatively short timeline for application submission and processing.
- Parents and students reported choosing a Magnet program because of their perceptions of the good educational quality of the program. Less than half of the parents interviewed were aware of other voluntary integration options available to them in the District.
- Parents and students appeared to be generally satisfied with the program and the vast majority chose to re-enroll for the subsequent year.

Student Enrollment. In examining the racial/ethnic backgrounds of students electing to participate in Magnet programs, we found that:

- The overall student enrollment and the number of participants from each racial/ethnic group has increased over time.
- Black students and White students represented about one-third each of the population of magnet students, while Hispanics students accounted for about one-fifth of the enrollment. Given the representation of these groups in the District-at-large, Black and White students are over-represented in the program while Hispanics students are under-represented.
- When enrollments were examined program by program, slightly more than half of the elementary programs met the District-established desegregation criterion (40 - 60% PHBAO). About one-third of the junior high, senior high, and extended grade programs met this criterion. The majority of the secondary magnets were centers located on PHBAO campuses.

Policies, Practices, and Services Influencing Integration. In examining actions taken in Magnet programs that encourage or inhibit integrated interactions among students of different ethnic backgrounds, we found that:

- Administrators of elementary programs tended to report a strong influence of school policies on interaction among students. Administrators of secondary and extended programs saw student interaction as influenced to a greater extent by school personnel and by the students themselves.

- Active efforts were taken in Magnet programs to encourage interaction among students of different racial/ethnic groups, through such techniques as student assignment to games and activities, active recruitment for organized activities, and inservice training. These actions were evident during both years, although the incidence of inservice training for high school teachers was considerably lower during 1982-83 as compared to the previous year.

- Magnet programs provided a wide variety of programmatic services for students, staff, and parents. Most of these services were viewed as moderate to very effective. However, teachers and administrators in elementary and extended programs consistently noted less success in encouraging student participation in after-school activities in both years. Additional transportation arrangements for after-school activities were less frequent at these levels as compared to secondary programs. In contrast, while securing parental participation was noted as a problem area in 1981-82 by teachers in junior high, senior high, and extended programs, they viewed activities as much more successful in this regard in 1982-83.

- A variety of college counseling services, such as individual counseling, meetings on college requirements, and financial aid, was provided for students requirements and financial aid. However, there was considerable variability in the number of students and parents participating in these activities across programs.

- The need for additional resources and equipment was frequently noted by teachers and administrators.

- Teachers and administrators also noted the need to improve the match, in some cases, between the interests of students and programmatic offerings in the selection process.

Program Fidelity. A sub-study of new senior high Magnet programs conducted during 1981-82 indicated that:

- The newly implemented senior high magnets showed a strong correspondence between their programs as planned and as implemented. Most deviations from plans occurred because resources were unavailable to support specialized facilities or materials. Teachers and administrators were generally enthusiastic about these new programs. (Similar findings emerged in a sub-study of the fidelity of programs at other levels conducted the previous year.)

Program Outcomes. The Team's examination of program outcomes centered around the progress made in reducing the four harms of racial isolation identified in the Crawford decision: achievement, attitudes toward school, post-secondary opportunities, and social interaction among students of different ethnic backgrounds. We found that:

- The average achievement of magnet students in grades 5, 6, and 8 in sampled Magnet programs was consistently above that of students in the District-at-large. Furthermore, when the average performance of students in different types of programs was examined, these averages surpassed the District-established mastery criteria on the SES for all program types at both grades 5 and 6. At grade 8, the average performance of students in different types of programs exceeded District averages with two exceptions. Thus, the consistently higher performance of students in Magnet programs is not accounted for solely by students in highly gifted and gifted programs but can be seen in the other types of programs as well.

- The attitudes of students toward school in elementary, junior high, and senior high Magnet programs were generally positive and stable over the two-year period. Their performance was consistently above the 50th percentile on published national norms during both years. Students enrolled in extended or alternative school programs tended to score consistently below their counterparts in the same grade levels on all sub-scales of the attitude measure. It is unclear whether the consistently lower attitudes of students in alternative programs were a reaction to the program itself or a function of the type of students who were drawn to this type of Magnet program.

- While limited information was available on post-secondary opportunities due to the recent establishment of most senior high programs and the limited number of 12th grade students, the majority of seniors sampled reported that they expected to receive a high school diploma. Further, about 70% expected to pursue some type of post-secondary education. However, due to missing data it was not possible to assess their preparation or eligibility for these pursuits.

• Social interaction among students of various ethnic backgrounds was frequent and friendly in elementary programs. In junior high, senior high, and extended programs, intergroup interaction was somewhat less frequent; however, it tended to be positive when it occurred. The less extensive intergroup interaction in junior and senior high programs is due, at least in part, to the reduced opportunities for such interactions. Many of these programs operate as centers on PHBAO campuses so that, to some extent, opportunities for interaction are diminished.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the two-year study summarized above, the Team formulated the following recommendations for the Magnet programs:

1. Simplify the prose in the "Choices" brochure to lower the readability level to at least the 8th grade level.

2. Reformat the "Choices" brochure to more clearly distinguish sections related to the PWT and Magnet programs.

3. Develop separate applications for the PWT and Magnet programs with a simplified format.

4. Provide additional personnel and/or pre-recorded informational tape recordings to handle parent questions and inquiries during the application submission period.

5. Distribute the "Choices" brochure to all students in the District.

6. Move up the time period for distribution of brochures and submission of applications. Extend the amount of time for the processing of applications.

7. Examine in greater depth barriers to participation of Hispanic students in the Magnet programs and take actions to encourage their participation.

8. Consider providing additional transportation to elementary and extended magnets to encourage participation of students in after-school activities.

9. Provide inservice training for administrators, particularly at the secondary school level, on policies and techniques for promoting positive intergroup relations and fostering communication among students of different racial/ethnic groups.

10. Develop and implement a plan for identifying, prioritizing, and alleviating deficiencies in resources and equipment required to support the specialized educational offerings of Magnet programs.

11. Investigate further the attitudes of students enrolled in alternative programs and provide appropriate interventions to improve their attitudes.

12. Monitor the post-secondary preparation and eligibility of high school Magnet students and take actions as appropriate.